

## **EXHIBIT 13**

N7CCede1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 DR. SARI EDELMAN,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

21 Civ. 502 (LJL)

6 NYU LANGONE HEALTH SYSTEM, *et*  
7 *al.*,

8 Defendants.

Trial

-----x

9 New York, N.Y.

10 July 12, 2023

9:00 a.m.

11 Before:

12 HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN,

13 District Judge

14 -and a Jury-

15 APPEARANCES

16 MILMAN LABUDA LAW GROUP PLLC

Attorneys for Plaintiff

17 BY: JOSEPH M. LABUDA

EMANUEL S. KATAEV

18 TARTER KRINSKY & DROGIN LLP

Attorneys for Defendants

19 BY: RICHARD C. SCHOENSTEIN

20 RICHARD L. STEER

21 INGRID J. CARDONA

N7CCede1

Edelman - Cross

1 trial.

2 Q. Other than that, you don't recall any?

3 A. I don't recall any others.

4 Q. You started your private practice in 2008; correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And that's when you did the office build-out that you  
7 talked about yesterday?

8 A. Yes, around that time, 2007, 2008.

9 Q. And the practice was owned 50/50 by you and Dr. Mehta?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. And we'll meet her next, she's the next witness in this  
12 case?

13 A. I believe so.

14 Q. And you two were the main physicians in the practice, you  
15 were the only full-time physicians in the practice?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. You had rented offices on a 20-year lease; correct?

18 A. I'm sorry. Can you rephrase the question.

19 Q. The private practice that you ran was in an office that you  
20 rented; right?

21 A. Yes, we leased the space.

22 Q. And you said it was a 20-year lease. Was it 20-year or  
23 15-year?

24 A. I believed it was 20 years. I might have been mistaken.

25 Q. You said yesterday that the lease was on favorable terms.

N7cWede4

Mehta - Direct

1 it was offered into evidence, but is there any dispute that RRR  
2 is in evidence?

3 MR. KATAEV: No, your Honor.

4 THE COURT: OK.

5 And I see defendants shaking their head that there's  
6 no dispute that RRR is in evidence.

7 MR. SCHOENSTEIN: It can be in evidence. I don't  
8 think we actually did offer it, but we can put it in evidence.

9 THE COURT: OK. So RRR is received.

10 (Defendants' Exhibit RRR received in evidence)

11 BY MR. KATAEV:

12 Q. Showing you Plaintiff's Exhibit 39, this indicates that you  
13 received a \$10,000 raise, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And it did, in fact, occur in February of 2021, correct?

16 A. That was the effective date.

17 Q. And to your knowledge, you have the same RVU target?

18 A. Yes.

19 MR. KATAEV: I'd like to offer Plaintiff's Exhibit 40  
20 in evidence.

21 THE COURT: Any objection?

22 MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No.

23 THE COURT: 40 is received and may be published to the  
24 jury.

25 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 40 received in evidence)

N7cWede6

Antonik - Direct

1 she was terminated, correct?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. And her position as a doctor was on par with all the other  
4 rheumatologists at the office, correct?

5 A. Some of the other rheumatologists had different titles.

6 Q. But they nonetheless performed services as rheumatologists,  
7 correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And those duties were the same, correct?

10 A. They all saw patients in the office.

11 Q. You also had the additional responsibility of overseeing  
12 Dr. Edelman and the other doctors in terms of their operations,  
13 right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. These include the operational aspects of the doctor's role,  
16 such as the number of patients seen and the RVUs earned, right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you did, in fact, review Dr. Edelman's RVUs earned to  
19 measure her performance while she worked there, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And there was never a problem in that regard, correct?

22 A. Not that I recall.

23 Q. Now, Dr. Edelman is just one of 85 other doctors that you  
24 oversaw in that regard, correct?

25 A. Correct.